DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 812 CE 029 820

AUTHOR Cheney-Stern, Marilyn R.; Phelps, L. Allen
TITLE Development of Procedures for Assessing the Impact of Vocational Education Research and Development on Vocational Education (Project IMPACT). Volume 3--A Case Study of the Illinois Network of Exemplary Occupational Education Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana.
SPONS AGENCY Illinois State Office of Education, Springfield. Div. of Adult Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE Aug 80
CONTRACT R-31-20-X-0141-166
NOTE 76p.; For related documents see ED 203 119 and CE 029 818-826.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Demonstration Programs; *Disabilities; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Assessment; Educational Change; *Educational Research; *Evaluation Methods; Learning Disabilities; Mainstreaming; Mental Retardation; Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Research Utilization; Secondary Education; *Special Education; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Education Amendments 1976; Illinois; *Illinois Network Exemplary Occup Educ Prog

ABSTRACT

As part of Project IMPACT's efforts to develop procedures for complying with the impact requirements of Public Law 94-482, a case study was made of the Illinois Network of Exemplary Occupational Education Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students. The purpose of the Network was to expand the quantity and quality of special needs vocational education in the state of Illinois. In 1978-79, the Network was comprised of nine demonstration sites and a dissemination site; in addition, the Network was also a source of materials, processes, consulting services, and inservice training appropriate for special needs vocational education. Incomplete evaluative data suggests that the Network's products have been fairly widely diffused, and that at least "awareness" of the Network was possessed by all educators in Illinois. The most interesting and unique feature of the Network from the point of view of Project IMPACT was the quality and quantity of interaction between the Network and the Research and Development section of the Illinois Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE). This interaction was accomplished through annual funding proposals prepared by the Network that served as evaluative tools for changes implemented by DAVTE. Project IMPACT recommended the following investigations of the Network: documenting that the "awareness" focus of the project deserves as much attention as the "expertise" focus; study of the characteristics and activities that made the director of the dissemination site so effective; further study of product adoption; more document analysis; and further study of the Research and Development Section's control of the Network for possible replication. (KC)

ED206812

# DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (PROJECT IMPACT)

## Volume 3 - A Case Study of the Illinois Network of Exemplary Occupational Education Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Donald F. Muirheid, Chairman

ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Joseph M. Cronin, State Superintendent of Education

CE 029 820

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Reisinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# Developing of Procedures for Assessing the Impact of Vocational Education Research and Development on Vocational Education (PROJECT IMPACT)

Principal Investigators: Marilyn K. Cheney-Stern, Ph.D. and L. Allen Phelps, Ph.D.,

Project Director: Rupert N. Evans, Ph.D.

University of Illinois

Urbana, Illinois

August, 1980

# DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Donald F. Muirheid, Chairman

ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Joseph M. Cronin, Superintendent

Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education

Springfield, Illinois
August, 1980

Procedures for Assessing the Impact of Vocational Education Research and Development on Vocational Education - R-31-20-X-0141-166 were developed pursuant to a funding agreement with the Illinois Office of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education/Research and Development Section, 100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois, 62777. Opinions expressed in this report do not reflect, nor should they be construed as policy or opinion of the State Board of Education/Illinois Office of Education or its staff.

Abstract

In order to identify and develop procedures for complying with the impact requirements of Public Law 94-482, PROJECT IMPACT studied five problems: (1) how to define impact, (2) how to assess impact, (3) how to show cause and effect relationships between research ad development (R&D) activities and changes in the vocational education teaching-learning situation, (4) how to predict the probability of impact, and (5) how to facilitate the impact of R&D activities. The methods used in these studies were to review and discuss views of experts and literature related to the problems and to analyze the process in vocational education in Illinois. Findings of PROJECT IMPACT's activities from August 1, 1978 to July 1, 1980 are reported in nine volumes: (1) Context and Principles of Assessing Impact, (2) A Case Study of the Illinois Occupational Curriculum Project, (3) A Case Study of the Illinois Network of Exemplary Occupational Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students, (4) A Case Study of Illinois Projects in Horticulture, (5) A Case Study of Illinois Career Education Projects at The Awareness Level, (6) A Case Study of the Occupational Survival Skills Project, (7) Case Studies of Two Illinois School Districts with Innovative Vocational Education Programs, (8) A Field Study of Predicting Impact of Research and Development Projects in Vocational and Technical Education, and (9) an Executive Summary.

Volume 3 traces the activities of the "Network" from its origins in 1975 to the present. It documents and discusses the "Network's" impacts and offers suggestions for continued monitoring of these impacts both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Authors' Acknowledgements

PROJECT IMPACT is greatly indebted to the staff and consultants of the Illinois Network of Exemplary Occupational Education Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students and to the many school administrators and teachers who gave their time and energies toward the completion of questionnaires, personal interviews, telephone conversations, and document retrievals which provided the information for this report. We also appreciate the contributions made by our contract administrators at the Research and Development Section, by our consultants and by our colleagues at the University of Illinois. We are especially grateful for the excellent assistance the secretaries in the College of Education at the University of Illinois gave us in preparing this report. The case study was prepared by Kurt Braun during FY 79 and the investigation and preparation of the postscript investigation were done by E. Catherine Day and L. Allen Phelps during FT 80.

Kurt Braun

E. Catherine Day

L. Allen Phelps

# TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Abstract . . . . . | 3 |
| Authors' Acknowledgements. . . . . | 4 |
| Overview of PROJECT IMPACT . . . . . | 6 |
| Case Study of the Illinois Network of Exemplary . . . . . | 10 |
| Occupational Education Programs for Handicapped | |
| and Disadvantaged Students | |
| 1. Narrative Report of the "Network" . . . . . | 10 |
| 1.1 Introduction. . . . . | 10 |
| 1.2 General Description . . . . . | 15 |
| 1.3 Origins . . . . . | 19 |
| 1.4 Development. . . . . | 23 |
| 1.5 Formative Evaluation . . . . . | 25 |
| 1.6 Diffusion . . . . . | 27 |
| 1.7 Adoption and Summative Evaluation . . . . | 29 |
| 1.8 Future . . . . . | 32 |
| 1.9 Summary . . . . . | 32 |
| 1.10 Conclusions . . . . . | 34 |
| 1.11 Recommendations . . . . . | 36 |
| 2. Critical Decisions Affecting the "Network". . . . . | 37 |
| 3. Major Events of the "Network" . . . . . | 38 |
| 4. Postscript to the "Network" . . . . . | 40 |

## Overview of PROJECT IMPACT

In 1974, the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) asked the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to assess the impact of approximately 250 million dollars spent by USOE on vocational education research and development (R & D) activities during the ten years between 1965 and 1974. The NAS committee on Vocational Education Research and Development (COVERD 1976) reported that the R & D of the decade studied had impact on curriculum development but did not have documented, widespread impact on the knowledge, skills or employability of large numbers of students. National evaluations of vocational R & D in addition to the COVERD report have been similarly critical (Development Associates, 1975; Rand Corporation, 1975; Comptroller General of the United States, 1974). Acting upon these reports, Congress passed the Educational Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 94-482) which mandated that contracts for R & D in vocational education not be allowable unless the applicant could "demonstrate a reasonable probability that the contract would result in improved teaching techniques or curriculum materials that would be used in a substantial number of classrooms or other learning situations within five years after termination of such contracts" (Federal Register, 1977).

PROJECT IMPACT is a state funded study designed to develop procedures for assessing the impact of vocational education research and development efforts on vocational education. The primary purpose of the study is to identify and develop procedures for complying with the impact requirement of Public Law 94-482.

The study addresses itself to three problem areas: (1) how to define impact, (2) how to assess impact, and (3) how to show a cause-and-effect relationship between project activities and changes in the vocational education teaching-learning situations. The study also addressed two subsidiary problems: (1) how to predict the probability of impact and (2) how to manage on-going contracts to increase impact probability.

The methods used to conduct this study were to review literature related to the problem areas, to interview individuals with experience and expertise in the problem areas, and to analyze the process of impact of several programs of related projects which were funded by the Illinois Office of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education/Research and Development Section and one project funded by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA).

The major activity of PROJECT IMPACT has been to analyse programs (cases) of related R & D projects. For the first year, it was decided to select two cases for "top-down" analysis and two cases for "bottom-up" analysis (see Volume 1, Appendix A, p. 43). The project staff referred to these types of retrospective analysis as "tracking." It was anticipated that the two types of tracking would produce different insights about impact. For example, bottom-up tracking might better identify "bottlenecks" to impact than would top-down tracking while "top-down" tracking might be more effective in relating project intents and project outcomes. One staff member was assigned as "tracking manager" for each of the four cases and was instructed to keep a detailed log of her/his activities (e.g., identifying documents, retrieving documents, identifying key people and interviewing them, recording data, analyzing data).

Nominations for the first four case studies were sought from members of PROJECT IMPACT's Advisory Committee, project consultants, and project staff members. The following cases were selected for "top-down" tracking:

1. "A Research and Development Project in Occupational Education" (The Illinois Occupational Curriculum Project--I.O.C.P.) which was developed by Joliet Junior College and funded by them and by the Illinois Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education in fiscal years 1970-72.
2. "The Illinois Network of Exemplary Occupational Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students." At the time the case study was initiated, the network was in its fourth year of operation. It was in the "dissemination" stage and IOE/DAVTE had funded Illinois State University to coordinate dissemination for the Network's eight demonstration projects.

The third and fourth cases, which were selected for "bottom-up" tracking, were:

3. "Illinois Projects in Horticulture." IOE/DAVTE funded some twelve R & D projects in horticulture between 1967 and 1978. Both private and public schools participated in these R & D efforts.
4. "Illinois Career Education Projects at the Awareness Level." IOE/DAVTE funded three or more major projects in this area between 1970 and 1978, and CETA began funding one for the Illinois Department of Corrections in 1975.

During its second year PROJECT IMPACT studied the "Occupational Survival Skills Project" and "Two Illinois School Districts with

Innovative Vocational Education Programs" and developed a model for an "Impact Assessment System for the Illinois Board of Education/Division of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education/Research and Development Section."

PROJECT IMPACT's activities for the 1979 and 1980 fiscal years are reported in nine volumes. Volume 1--Context and Principles of Assessing Impact--contains an introduction to PROJECT IMPACT, a review of literature and views of experts in regard to planned educational change and impact, the methods used to conduct impact case studies, a concise listing of references used during Phase 1 activities, and appended materials such as the initial project proposal and data collection instruments which were developed for use in case studies. Supplemental reports of the project are contained in the following volumes:

Volume 2 -- A Case Study of the "Illinois Occupational Curriculum Project"

Volume 3 -- A Case Study of the "Illinois Network of Exemplary Occupational Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students"

Volume 4 -- A Case Study of "Illinois Projects in Horticulture"

Volume 5 -- A Case Study of "Illinois Career Education Projects at the Awareness Level"

Volume 6 -- A Case Study of the "Occupational Survival Skills Project"

Volume 7 -- Case Studies of "Two Illinois School Districts with Innovative Vocational Education Programs"

Volume 8 -- A Field Study of "Predicting Impact of Research and Development Projects in Vocational and Technical Education"

Volume 9 -- Executive Summary of Volumes 1-8 and Conclusions and Recommendations for Assessing the Impact of Vocational Education Research and Development on Vocational Education

## A Case Study of the Illinois Network of Exemplary Occupational Education Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students

The steps in tracking this top-down case were to collect data on the origins, development, field testing, evaluation, diffusion, adoption and the future of the "Network." The case study report is presented in three sections--a narrative report, a summary of critical decisions and a chronology of major events of the "Network."

### 1. Narrative Report of the "Network"

The narrative report is organized as follows: introduction, general description, origins, development, evaluation, diffusion, adoption, future, summary and conclusions.

#### 1.1 Introduction

The Illinois Network of Exemplary Occupational Education Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students was funded by the Illinois Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education of the from 1975-1979 at a cost of 1.6 million dollars. The purpose of the Network was to expand the quantity and quality of special needs vocational education in the State of Illinois.

The Network has several features which are attractive to researchers and others interested in impact. Among these are:

- The Network is an example of a research and development activity done primarily by local education agency (LEA) personnel at multiple sites.
- Special needs vocational education is currently enjoying the attention of many vocational educators, many of whom are relatively unfamiliar with the area.
- Diffusion and dissemination are high priorities within the Network.

- Like many other research and development activities in vocational education, the Network is focused more on demonstration than on research.

These and lesser characteristics of the Network make it fertile ground for investigation of the impact of vocational education research activities.

In 1978-79 the Network was comprised of nine sites. One centrally located site was devoted to dissemination and also functioned as a means of coordinating the efforts of the Network. The other sites existed throughout the state and consisted of one community college, one area vocational center, and six comprehensive high schools. As part of the Network dissemination process, most of the Network sites have consultative arrangements with five nearby schools which are called "satellite" sites. In addition to providing Illinois educators with accessible programs for on site viewing, the Network is also a source of materials, processes, consulting services and inservice training appropriate for special needs vocational education.

Problems in document retrieval, common to ex post facto impact studies (COVERD Report, 1976, p. 42) placed rather severe constraints on data used for this study. Most of the information used to describe the origins of the Network (discussed earlier) was obtained through interviews with key persons at DAVTE and in the Network. Data on the history of the Network since its inception in the fall of 1975 was based on available documents (see Table 1) and interviews (see Table 2).

Table 1

Items Used in Document Analysis

Products:

Individual Performance Checklist (A basic skill check list for trainable level students)

Career Exploration Booklet

Network News (several issues)

Project Booklet (A dissemination description of the Network)

Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students: The Legislation and the Programs ( A slide/sound presentation)

Resource Catalog (A catalog of Network products and services)

Documents:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1975 | Sauk Site Proposal |
| 1976 | Sauk Site Proposal |
| 1977 | Sauk Evaluation Report |
| 1977 | Composite Report of Nine Project Sites |
| 1978 | Requests for Site Proposals |
| 1978 | Proposal Review Checklist |
| 1978 | Sauk Site Proposal |
| 1978 | Technical Assistance for Adoption/Adaption of Occupational Education for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students |
| 1978 | Diffusion Site Proposal |
| 1978 | Triton Site Proposal |
| 1978 | Herrin Site Proposal |

Additional documents included:

- Copies of notes used to make presentations and the 1977 and 1978 American Vocational Association National Conferences
- Three binders of letters, memos, monthly reports, conference presentations, news releases, etc. obtained from the dissemination site at Illinois State University.

| Data On | Interviewee Description | Interview Instrument | Time taken in minutes rounded to nearest 5 min. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Origins | Director of Research and Development Section | Questions based on Narrative Outline | 140 |
| The Network as a Whole | Director of Diffusion and Development Section | Questions based on Narrative Outline | 130 |
| Diffusion | Director of Diffusion Site | Project Director's Interview | 110 |
| Individual Network sites | "Down-state" director | Project Director's Interview | 130 |
| | Suburban director | Project Director's Interview | 115 |
| | Urban director | Project Director's Interview | 75 |
| Adoption | Administrator Participant of State-wide Conference | Open questions | 135 |

Table 2. Interviews

Many of the retrieved documents reflected only a with-a-single-site perspective (e.g., proposals, contractual agreements, newletters). While other documents retrieved from the dissemination sites frequently treated the Network as a single entity, many of these were focused on specific areas such as budgets, monthly reports, project director meeting agendas, and conference presentations. Despite the ameliorative language used for dissemination, brochures describing the Network were useful for development of a picture of the Network. While no single document exists which would give the reader a broad-based view of what the Network was really like, the Spring '77 "Composite Report of Nine Project Sites" gave a good Network wide picture of the Network during the 1976-1977 school year.

In addition to document analysis six interviews were conducted. The interviews were focused on developing informational depth not available through documents. These included:

- o Origins. Most of the information on the origin and development of the Network was obtained from the director of the Research and Development Section of DAVTE who was largely responsible for the Network as an idea.
- o The Network as a Whole. Interview data on the Network as a single entity were obtained primarily from the diffusion site director.
- o Individual Network Sites. Three project directors were interviewed from "down-state," suburban and urban Network sites.
- o Diffusion. Interview data on diffusion were obtained from the director of the diffusion site.
- o Adoption. Interview data were obtained from an interview with an administrator who attended the fall 1977 state-wide conference and was chosen on the basis of a letter requesting information on the conference which was on file at the diffusion site.

The tracking manager of the Network case study also had the opportunity to discuss Network activities informally with staff at DAVTE,

Network workshop staff, faculty at the University of Illinois who consulted with the Network and several of the participants of a local inservice workshop.

### 1.2 General Description

A resource catalog, printed and disseminated by the Network, contained descriptions of most of the products developed by Network sites plus additional materials and procedures which were adopted or adapted by the Network.

Each item in the resource catalog was briefly described and had additional information indicating target population, need for inservice training, possible consultant availability and ordering information. The volume of product development and product adaption/adoption was indeed impressive (see Table 3).

| Site | Number of Products |
|---|---|
| Illinois State University | 5 |
| Chicago -- Tilden High School | 10 |
| Edwardsville | 18 |
| Herrin | 2 |
| Joliet | 28 |
| Mt. Prospect | 11 |
| Sauk Area Career Center | 12 |
| Springfield | 15 |
| Triton College | 3 |
| Other (Forest View) | 1 |
| | 60 total |

| Product Categories | Number of Products |
|---|---|
| Administration | 36 |
| Community Resources | 16 |
| Curriculum | 34 |
| Support Services | 38 |
| Inservice | 25 |
| Special Techniques | 21 |
| Special Programs | 17 |
| Individualized Planning | 28 |
| | 215 total* |

* Actual individual products was 60. The 215 figure is a reflection of cross indexing.

Table 3. Breakdown of the number of dissemination products developed, adapted or adopted within the Network by site and by product category.

For the most part Network products were not fiel tested. This is unfortunate for several reasons. Field test data would have been valuable in assessing the impact of the Network. The absence of field test data also deprives potential users of valuable information on projected outcomes of product use. Perhaps the most serious result of failure to field test these materials was the expressed reluctance at DAVTE and at the Illinois State University dissemination site to push for product use because they did not have data on effectiveness of the materials. In many ways these materials were developed in specific circumstances. That is, most of the products were developed to meet specific, day-to-day local educational agency problems. These products represent solutions of educational problems by educators, and students and many educators (and researchers) could probably learn much from them.

## Project Staff

Even prior to the first year, DAVTE expressed enthusiasm for "grassroots" input. Ultimately, broad based local pressure to see effective (exemplary) vocational programming for disadvantaged and handciapped students was an important factor in the origin of the idea of the Network. It is not surprising, then, that DAVTE relied heavily on local school districts for the writing of proposals and later for staffing the projects. Typically project directors were local classroom teachers or counselors who had demonstrated interest by involvement in proposal writing activities. As a group, project directors' work experience reflect more experience with special education than vocational education. Most project directors had little or not experience in either

administration or research prior to working with the Network. While interviews with three project directors showed the lack of both research and administrative experience, only the lack of administrative experience was mentioned as a difficult adjustment.

For DAVTE's part, though, the RFPs were sent out jointly by both the Research and Development Section and the Special Programs Section. During the first year DAVTE coordination of Network activity was the responsibility of two individuals in the Special Programs Section. Although both of these individuals had research experience, there is little evidence that much in the way of research and development strategies and tactics were transmitted to the project directors. Part of this may be due to repeated reports that these individuals from the Special Programs Section had quite divergent views on the quality and quantity of direction provided to project directors. While one Special Programs consultant was prepared to provide specific strategies for problem solving, the other was more interested in allowing project directors an opportunity to solve their own problems. The resulting inconsistency was apparently confusing to some of the project directors.

It is not surprising, then, that most interviewed individuals mentioned some difficulties encountered during the first year. Indeed, the evaluation of the first year's activities noted that the projects had considerable difficulty in defining program activities in specific (identifiable and measurable) terms--a rather basic research and development skill.

While the staffing patterns set during the first year resulted in a rather low level of research and development experience, it is important to realize that this was in large part unavoidable since research and

development experience is difficult to obtain within a public school district. There is also some evidence that the project directors, long on classroom and local school experience within the site district, had good rapport with local administrators, teachers and students which might have been a problem if project directors had been "outsiders" with research skills. Perhaps even more important, practitioners and researchers frequently complain about difficulty in being understood by each other. Such problems did not appear to exist with regard to Network dissemination activities and communication between Network staff and other local educational agency staff. Thus, the Network may shed some light on how to best communicate findings to individual classrooms or local educational agencies.

The director of the dissemination site was a dynamic individual who was responsible for much of the success of the Network. For example, there is considerable evidence that had it not been for the director of the dissemination site, the Network would not have been funded by DAVTE for the fourth year. When site directors were probed for criticism of coordination personnel, all three project directors voiced past problems dealing with DAVTE but voiced nothing less than praise for the director of the dissemination site. One of the site project directors listed the coordinating efforts of the dissemination site director as one of the "three factors [felt to be] especially important in facilitating the implementation" of this director's project.

### 1.3 Origins

The 1968 Vocational Education Amendments spurred much interest in handicapped and disadvantaged students among vocational educators

nationally and Illinois was no exception. The Illinois Office of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE), interpreted the 1968 legislation as a mandated effort to mainstream special needs students into vocational education. While the 1968 amendments provided set aside monies to assist local schools in meeting the needs of these special students, by 1970 Illinois, as did other states (GAO, 1974) experienced some difficulty in spending the set aside monies. By 1972, DAVTE's awareness and concern over meeting the mandated needs of handicapped and disadvantaged students was manifested in two research projects funded by its Research and Development Unit.* While the projects' reports did much to focus the scope of the problems and suggested a certain amount of direction for problem solving, the Research and Development Unit received many grass roots requests for further information between 1972 and 1974. Most local educators were asking where they could go to view vocational programs which met the needs of the handicapped and disadvantaged.

At about the same time the Research and Development Unit was receiving requests for demonstration of techniques in the area of special needs vocational education, a federally funded career education demonstration site in Joliet was drawing the attention of several Research and Development staff members. The idea of a demonstration project was reinforced by this activity in Joliet. Due to continued difficulty in spending the set aside money, it became apparent by the end of 1974 that some $400,000 of part B funds was available for several demonstration sites in the area of special needs vocational education. In the

---

*Project reports by TERC and by Weisman (no date).

spring of 1975, requests for proposals were sent out jointly by the Research and Development Section and the Special Programs Section of DAVTE for local demonstration sites. DAVTE hoped to fund eight to fourteen sites with the available funds. Nine of the resulting nineteen proposals were funded.

Several factors were important to the development of the idea of the Network and these can be summarized as follows:

1. The 1968 Vocational Amendments which mandated the need.
2. The TERC and Weisman studies which, as traditional forms of research were not readily usable by local educators, but nonetheless supported the need for educational strategies to meet special needs.
3. Grass roots pressure "to see" the techniques needed for serving handicapped and disadvantaged students.
4. A timely demonstration precedent at Joliet in another area of interest to vocational educators.
5. The availability of funds which was ironically a result of the difficulty in identifying, cost accounting and meeting the vocational needs of handicapped and disadvantaged students.

While these five factors seem to be obviously important to the "prehistory" of the Network, it should also be recognized that the personalities and efforts of many individuals, both in and out of DAVTE played many important roles in the origins of the Network. In addition, two other major pieces of legislation (94-142 and 94-482) supported the formulation of the Network.

The original Network was comprised of nine sites. Eight public school districts were incided, each with several program components aimed at meeting various vocational needs of mostly secondary disadvantaged and handicapped students. These original sites included:

| | |
|---|---|
| Chicago -- Tilden High School | Dist. 299 |
| Edwardsville | Community Unit Dist. 7 |
| Herrin | Community Unit Dist. 4 |
| Joliet | Dist. 204 |
| Mt. Prospect | Dist. 214 |
| Rockford Area Vocational Center | |
| Sauk Area Career Center | |
| Springfield | Dist. 186 |

In addition to these eight secondary school sites, the Network also included a post-secondary site at Triton College. In addition to these sites, an inservice coordinator, housed in Springfield, provided much of the coordination function which was later (fall of 1977) taken over by the dissemination site at Illinois State University in Normal. Some of the coordination function was been retained by DAVTE throughout the project's history (e.g., site visits and monthly project directors meetings).

The number and diversity of the secondary school sites reflect DAVTE's concern that each non-Network district would be able to locate within the Network programs which could be reasonably expected to be generalizable to their own local needs. That is, the variability within the Network was designed, to a certain extent, to mirror the variability of local school needs throughout the state. Some of the more important factors of variability which existed within the Network included:

1. Population Quality. Within the Network programs activities were aimed at a variety of handicapped including deaf, blind, mentally retarded, etc. In addition, both rural and urban disadvantaged students were served.

2. Population Quantity. Both large and small (consolidated) districts were included.

3. Availability of local resources. Affluent and less affluent districts were included.

As originally conceived, the Network was to be funded for three years (Deviation from the plan is discussed in the following section--Development). The original three year plan called for three phases, each corresponding to a school year. The first (1975-1976) was the planning or needs-assessment year. The second (1976-1977) was aimed at implementation and evaluation. The third and final year (1977-1978) was focused on diffusion of Network developments to other schools throughout Illinois.

Consistent with the grass-roots pressure which lead to the origin of the Network, product development of instructional techniques and programs was (and is) left to the local school district. Coordination of these diverse sites involved three groups of people.

1. DAVTE Special Programs Section
2. DAVTE Steering Committee
3. The Network Inservice Coordinator (1975-1976) and the Network dissemination site at Illinois State University (fall 1977-79).

Much of the Network coordination effort was to be accomplished by two staff members of the Special Programs Section of DAVTE. Monthly project director meetings were also a very important coordination tool.

## 1.4 Development

At the inception of the Network the variability of programs and processes within the Network was great. Some of the Districts (e.g. Mount Prospect, Joliet) had had several years of experience prior to 1975. Other sites (e.g. Sauk and Herrin) were just beginning to think seriously about meeting the needs of handicapped and disadvantaged

students. Product development at all sites reflected the individual problems and available resources within the site district. For example, Joliet, a relatively resource rich district, developed a computerized identification and reporting system which is appropriate for facilitation of record keeping necessary for monitoring student progress and meeting legislative rule and regulation requirements for funding. Edwardsville, operating without such direct access to a computer, developed a similar identification system which does not require the utilization of computers.

The Springfield, Sauk and Joliet sites made use of a "mini-grant" system to encourage classroom teachers to develop procedures within their own classroom. Mini-grant money was used both for purchase of materials and, through direct payment to the individual educator, as a means of reinforcement and renumeration of extra time spent in product development.

In order to provide local school districts with demonstration sites as models, DAVTE felt the need to fund a diverse group of local programs for disadvantaged and handicapped students. Large and small, urban, rural, suburban, rich, poor, new and old programs and districts were represented in the eight sites. Thus, if a particular school was interested in improving its programming in vocational education for special students, it was likely that a similar school (or at least a similar problem situation) existed somewhere in the Network. For example, Sauk entered the Network as a new Area Vocational Center. Mt. Prospect, a resourceful suburban district, had considerable experience working with special needs students prior to entering the Network. Thus, a wide spectrum of school districts were represented to enhance generalizability to non-Network programs.

## 1.5 Evalaution

Three processes of evaluation were important to the Network. These were: internal (within site) evaluation at each site, third-party or external evaluation of site activities, annual submission of a proposal and final report.

Since funding patterns within the Network reflected annual grant cycles, it is difficult to categorize evaluation activities as either formative or summative. Both the external evaluation and proposal writing activities followed annual cycles. Since each of these appear to have effected changes in the following year, it may be more useful to conceptualize each as formative evaluation.

### In-house evaluation

All three interviewed project directors reported reliance on the annual proposal as a guide to internal formative evaluation. That is, activities and objectives outlined in proposals were used much like PERT (Program Evaluation and Review Technique) charts. Each director reported that although such reliance of the proposal often called for interpretation of soft data, frequent review of current proposals was useful in keeping project activities up to date.

Each project director was able to identify changes based on ongoing evaluation. Examples include expansion of types of employment for educable mentally handicapped students, and having a district teacher responsible for bringing workers to school to discuss jobs with students.

External evaluation

During the first two years of the Network external evaluation of Network Sites was provided by a tem of evaluators from LEAs and universities throughout the State. Evaluation teams visited each site during the Spring of 1976 and 1977, and composite reports were prepared for the school years of 1975-1976 and 1976-1977.

While the composite report for the school year 1975-1976 was not retrieved, allusions to the 1975-1976 report made in the 1976-1977 report shed some light on strengths and weaknesses of the first year. For example, one of the three strengths enumerated in the spring '77 report was that "every site has made great strides in forming demonstrable objectives with clear criteria in most cases." (page 2.) Such remarks are an indication of the responsiveness to evaluation within the Network. In a similar vein, the director of the Research and Development Section stated that he was very impressed with the ability of all Network sites to respond to the recommendations of the second external evaluation report.

Annual Proposals

Toward the end of each school year all sites prepared new proposals for the following year. Requests for proposals were developed by Research and Development Section staff familiar with the previous experiences of the sites. Thus the annual request for proposals and subsequent proposal writing cycle provided the Research and Development Section with a unique and apparently very workable administrative tool which, at least informally, relied on the evaluaton or reputation of the work done by the Network sites during the previous year.

Further investigation is needed to determine just how evaluative techniques were used to make decisions within the Network. It would be especially interesting to understand the relationship between Network evaluative processes and decisions regarding the elimination of Rockford as a site, the development and future of satellite sites, the extension of the Network into the fourth year, and decisions which determined the future of the Network.

### 1.6 Diffusion

Both the third and fourth years of the Network emphasized statewide diffusion. The first two years of the Network were devoted to the establishment of demonstrable programs at all sites. During the late spring and early summer of 1977, Network personnel spent considerable time collecting and organizing materials for dissemination. By fall of 1977, the project director at Sauk had become project director at a new diffusion site housed at Illinois State University at Normal.

One highlight of the 1977-1978 school year dissemination activities was a two day statewide conference held in Decatur during November 1977. The conference was attended by over 200 educators from throughout Illinois and several other states were also represented. The following section (on adoption) includes interview information collected from a "down-state" administrator who attended the statewide conference. In addition to conference presentations, each of the demonstration sites had exhibits which allowed participants to view site developed materials and to visit with site staff.

During the 1977-78 school year, the Network also printed and distributed booklets which described Network activities by site and included the names, phone numbers and addresses of each site director.

Each site description also included listings of "focal points" (e.g. guidance activities, program planning, support services) and available materials (e.g. Administrator Guide to Program Planning, Carpentry Manual for Special Needs Students). Additional 1977-78 school year dissemination activities included conference and workshop presentations in the state and nationally at the annual American Vocational Association meeting, and a quarterly newsletter on special needs vocationa education.

Diffusion activities for the 1978-1979 year were beefed up considerably. In late September, a statewide conference held in Chicago and sponsored by the Network drew over 500 persons from Illinois and other states. In addition, a workshop team conducted fifteen one day workshops at various locations throughout the state for local special and vocational educators interested in improving vocational programming for special needs students.

An additional interesting feature of fourth year activities was the satellite program. Seven of the nine demonstration sites had made consultive arrangements with nearby districts. Each demonstration site had five satellite sites. Triton College, the eighth demonstration site, was responsible for diffusion to other junior colleges throughout the state. Athough it is too early to estimate the success of the satellite program, the director of the Research and Development Section at DAVTE reported that the strategy appeared to be effective in approximately 50% of the cases. The satellite program is an example of current Network views which emphasized direct consultive assistance rather than simple materials dissemination.

Diffusion activities seemed to be geared for the local school administrator through catalogs, workshops and newsletters. More traditional forms of dissemination such as refereed journal articles were not used by the Network. A search of the ERIC (Educational Research and Informational Clearinghouse) system conducted in October of 1978 failed to identify any Network documents or materials. At the same time, the card catalog of the Curriculum Library housed with the DAVTE offices in Springfield revealed only three of the more than fifty materials developed by the Network.

### 1.7 Adoption

The Network seems to enjoy a high level of visibility both within the State of Illinois and to a certain extent nationally among educators interested in special needs vocational education. Two of the interviewed project directors mentioned problems in successfully attaining high project visibility within their own school districts. One director mentioned difficulty in getting school board approval for his Network site. The difficulty was attributed to recent voter moods regarding excessive taxation and one particularly money-conscious board member. This board member was unaffected by the argument that the monies for the Network program came from outside the district since the money still represented tax dollars. A second director mentioned competition from other deserving programs within his district as a barrier to high program visibility. This individual also suggested that the Network was not being pushed sufficiently among vocational educators, especially at the State level, as being a barrier to within district visibility.

A perusal of workshop evaluation forms and letters requesting information on file at the Illinois State University dissemination site bore

witness to the Network's ability to reach many educators. While such quantitative data are important, PROJECT IMPACT interviewed two workshop participants to assess more precisely the value of interactions with the Network.

One interviewed individual had attended a Network sponsored statewide conference in the fall of 1977 and a local one day workshop in the fall of 1978. The other individual was a fellow educator in the same school district who also attended the fall 1978 workshop. Since the second individual was in the presence of his supervisor during the interview, the interview data should be conservatively viewed as coming from a single individual.

The interviewee was very enthusiastic and positive about his contact with the Network. He described the fall 1977 conference as "fantastic." Specific conference components which were recalled spontaneously were the quality of presentations, including one by DAVTE staff, the "excellent" film on legislation, exhibits from the nine sites and a presentation on architectural barriers.

The participant stated that his chief purpose in attending the conference was to obtain information which would be helpful in motivating a local area vocational center to more readily accept handicapped and disadvantaged students. Unfortunatey, the participant was unable to achieve the desired results partly due to the board of the AVC being preoccupied with staff problems and partly because the participant had agreed to locate to another school district in another part of the state.

Before leaving the position, the staff from the closest Network site made repeated efforts to visit the participants' school district and programs. The participant repeatedly refused such efforts on the part

of the Network, explaining that program improvement in his district depended more on policy than on technical expertise. This did not entirely explain the paradox of the participant's refusal to allow a visit from the Network which he praised so highly. After all, what could the harm be?

When asked what specific things he could identify as adopted or adapted by the Network in his school district, the participant said none. By way of explanation, the participant stated that the local program already contained program components which resulted in mainstreaming which surpassed any mainstreaming accomplished by the Network. In addition, the participant questioned the generalizability of Network products as most school districts are so unique. The interviewer did, however, notice that materials developed by Phelps (1976) and Albright (1978) and disseminated by the Network were on a bookshelf in the participant's office. The participant also stated that he would like to visit the Sauk Area Career Center and the Herrin sites. The participant also stated that the conference experience had reinforced his own feelings and was in part responsible for much of his activities in his new job. Cited examples included:

1. Three district meetings of Vocational and Special educators.
2. Input to the one and five year plans.
3. A move to hire a special needs expert at a nearby AVC.
4. Efforts aimed toward production of several vocational curriculum task analyses.
5. Push to offer a special certificate which actually lists skills in which the student has demonstrated competencies.
6. Participation in a Network sponsored workshop by district vocational and special educators.

Information from the participant and a second person, both of whom recently attended a local Network workshop resulted in:

1. Confirmation that the district was moving in appropriate ways.
2. Plans to visit additional Network sites.
3. Plans to obtain inservice with regard to the Phelps materials.
4. The opportunity for district staff to spend an entire day thinking about and discussing pertinent issues.
5. The inspiration of the two presenters. ("They knew when the other was going to take a breath.")

### 1.8 The Future

The existence of the Network is evidence of DAVTE's commitment to ensure that the State of Illinois will meet the vocational education needs of disadvantaged and handicapped students. Since DAVTE is currently in the process of developing future priorities, details of future activities are not yet clear. The director of the Research and Development Section requested that future plans not be disclosed by PROJECT IMPACT at this time. However, plans for further activities with the same broad goal of the Network were being made for 1980-81.

### 1.9 Summary of the Impact of the Network

The absence of a coordinated proposal for the entire Network made it difficult to document the intended impacts for the Network. Nevertheless, an analysis of Network activities allows for the assumption of certain impacts which were intended by the Network. The Network files also contained data which were important for analysis of impact. At the present time, however, impact data are incomplete due to the recency of the Network. Also, much of the important impact data are scattered among the ten demonstration sites and nearly thirty-five

satellite sites. A "postscript" impact report for the Network should reflect a more accurate and finer grained analysis of Network impact. The following will give the reader a rough idea of the impact of the Network.

1. Groups Intended for Direct Impact.

The primary groups intended for direct impact by the network include:

A. Illinois secondary and to a lesser degree, post secondary teachers in the fields of vocational education,

B. Special Education,

C. Guidance, and

D. Administration.

2. Qualitiative indented impacts for the above groups awareness and expertise necessary for provding administrative and educational services aimed at meeting the vocational needs of handicapped and disadvantaged students.

Major target areas include:

A. Mainstreaming.

B. Individualized instruction.

C. Special techniques.

3. Quantitatively, it is assumed that the Network intends to impact all school personnel responsible for providing secondary and perhaps post secondary vocational education to handicapped and disadvantaged students throughout the State of Illinois. No estimate of the number of such persons is available at this time.

4. Judging from conversations with Network staff and a few workshop/conference participants, actual qualitative impact has been most successful in the area of "awareness." It seems to be the feeling of further affective training which will necessarily precede more cognitive information on targeted areas of mainstreaming and educational strategies. Presumably, work being done at satellite sites goes beyond awareness.

5. Actual quantitative direct impact of intended groups seems very high. Athough actual counts have yet to be made, judging from requests for materials, conference and workshop activities and consultive work including satellites, it is hard to imagine any targeted educators who have not at least heard of the Network.

6. Evidence exists which would indicate that the unintended but acutal qualitative and quantitative impact of the Network extends beyond the boundaries of the State of Illinois.

7. Handicapped and disadvantaged students and presumably their present and future employers constitute the groups targeted by the Network for indirect intended impact.

8. Student and employer impact data have yet to be collected by PROJECT IMPACT (See postscript to the "Network").

## 1.10 Conclusions

Perhaps the most interesting and unique feature of the Network was the quality and quantity of interaction between the Network and the Research and Development Section of DAVTE. The steering committee was exclusively Research and Development Section and Network staff. The R & D section worked very closely with all sites and was particularly close to the coordinating dissemination site at I.S.U. Numerous letters and memos between the director of the R & D section and the director of the dissemination site are extant.

The RFP and proposal cycle seem to have functioned administratively. That is, while Network projects were in existence for four funding years, the beginning of each cycle provided the funder (the R & D Section) with the opportunity to reformulate the Network's goals and strategies. The existence of the I.S.U. dissemination site, the extension to a fourth year, and the satellite programs are all examples of how RFPs were used to direct Network activities.

In a real sense, the R & D Section was the center of power in the Network. Major decisions (via the steering committee and close contact with all Network projects) and fiscal matters were usually channeled through DAVTE. This arrangement seems to have been an effective and flexible means of directing and coordinating this series of related

projects. (However, this arrangement does have drawbacks for the researcher interested in impact since it resulted in a reduced need for documents which would, like a Network wide proposal, clearly describe the purposes and interrelationships of all Network activities.)

The Network was not a sophisticated research operation. Research opportunities, especially in the area of field testing, were not taken advantage of by the Network. This lack of research sophistication was a drawback of the Network's valuaton of "grass roots" or local educator abilities. Part of what was lost due to lack of research sophistication was counter-balanced by the Network's apparent ability to relate well to target groups in local educational agencies. In the Network's true purpose to increase levels of vocational programming for handicapped and disadvantaged students rather than knowledge production, the low priority on research seems somewhat justifiable.

Again, assuming that a Network priority was to provide the technical and motivational assistance necessary to increase levels of vocational programming for special needs students, the loss of the Rockford site seems important. Part of the Network's and DAVTE's dissatisfaction with Rockford centered around Rockford's reluctance to mainstream handicapped students. This issue is central to both the legislation (1968 Vocational Amendments, P.L. 94-482 and P.L. 94-142) and to the philosophical views of the Network and DAVTE. Network experience in correcting this problem necessary to maintaining Rockford within the Network would surely have resulted in knowledge which would be helpful in motivating non-Network districts in other parts of the state. While the Network was comprised of various levels of technical abilities and similar resources between districts, Rockford seemed to be the only

site which could have provided the Network with experience in low motivational or awareness resources.

The Network seems to have made a shift from technical assistance (help in providing "how to" information) to "awareness." This change in strategy intimates an error of initial Network assumptions. At first, the Network seemed to assume that the basic problem in providing special needs vocational education was a matter of providing educators with skills. Later, Network practices seemed to focus on motivating vocational educators to accept responsibility for handicapped students. If documentation could be found of the need for this shift, it might prove to be an important Network finding.

Impact studies, like evaluation reports, frequently dwell on the more negative features of a project. The strengths of a project are the things which proceed smoothly and hence draw little attention. This is unfortunate. Overall, the design and day-to-day efforts of the Network are rather impressive.

### 1.11 Recommendations

The Network remains fertile ground for studying processes of impact. Several questions remain unanswered. PROJECT IMPACT recommends the following investigations:

- to document that "awareness" deserves at least as much attention as expertise in the area of special needs vocational education
- to study the characteristics and activities of the director of the dissemination site which made that person so effective in facilitating Network activities
- to obtain further information on adoption such as short case studies on adoption by satellite districts and districts which have had staff participation in Network workshops to be done

- o to conduct further document analysis
- o to further investigate the elimination of the Rockford site in an effort to understand motivational problems of effort to understand LEAs
- o to further study and document the Research and Development section's coordination of the Network. Specification of these coordinating procedures might assist other RCU's in replication of this means of making a coordinated research effort. Of particular interest is the apparent administrative use made of requests for proprosals.

## 2. Critical Decisions Affecting the "Network"

1. Perhaps the most critical decision or feature of the Network is tied to its grass roots origins. The resulting staffing patterns intimate a devaluation of research skills within the Network. While this may have increased the ability of the Network to work and deal with local educators, the absence of adequate product field testing data and other research strategies is disturbing.

2. At the end of the first year the director of the Research and Development Section took a leadership role in the coordination of the Network. This was necessary due to the dysfunction of the coordination role in the Special Needs Section and the loss of a key person who had been responsible for Network inservice training and coordination.

3. Toward the end of the third year the Network became committed to a fourth year for dissemination purposes.

4. The fourth year extension of the project was also a conscious effort to make qualitative change in diffusion strategies. The Network presently has adopted a role of change agent within satellite and other school districts.

5. No field testing program was initiated to assess the effectiveness of Network developed products. This default decision resulted in low levels of confidence in disseminating many Network developed materials other materials.

6. Because of basic difference in philosophy between the Network and the Rockford Area Vocational Center with regard to mainstreaming, the Rockford site was dropped at the end of the second year.

### 3. Major Events of the "Network"

Planning Year

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1975 | Third Quarter | Network begins with Nine Sites |
| | Fourth Quarter | |
| 1976 | First Quarter | Inservice Coordinator Leaves Network |
| | Second Quarter | Evaluation of First Year<br>Director of Research and Development Section Picks up Coordination Function |

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Implementation Year

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1976 | Third Quarter | |
| | Fourth Quarter | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1977 | First Quarter | |
| | Second Quarter | Second Annual Evaluation<br>Diffusion Site Begun<br>Rockford Site Dropped |

---

Diffusion/Demonstration Years

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1977 | Third Quarter | First Statewide Conference |
| | Fourth Quarter | Network Presented at AVA and CEC |
| 1978 | First Quarter | Plans for Fourth Year Begun |
| | Second Quarter | Inservice Training for Workshop Resenters |
| 1978 | Third Quarter | Fourth (Unplanned) Year Begins<br>Second Statewide Conference<br>Satellite Program Begins<br>Regional Workshops Conducted |
| | Fourth Quarter | Network Presented at AVA and CEC |
| 1979 | First Quarter (present) | Planning Future of Network |

## H & D NETWORK POSTSCRIPT: 1979-80

Perhaps the most interesting and complex issue associated with educational research and development is the issue of adoption and installation of successful or effective educational research and development outcomes. Over the past two years Project IMPACT has looked at a number of different types of research and development efforts that have been at various stages of adoption and/or nonadoption. As noted earlier, a retrospective impact analysis of the Network is interesting because of its focus on program development and improvement within local education agencies relative to a critical national problem confronting vocational educators, and the potential cumulative effect(s) associated with the "Network" design.

In 1979-80 the Network project was terminated by the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, Illinois State Board of Education. It is important to note, however, that the Department's research and program improvement thrust in the area of serving special needs populations was not diminished. In August, 1979, six Special Needs Field Consultants were employed. These individuals were assigned geographic regions of the state, and their activities focused upon providing direct inservice and program development assistance to local education agencies. While none of the six individuals had previously been employed at a Network site, most of them had had some prior in-depth involvement with the Network via participation in evaluation teams or by serving in advising and/or consulting roles to the Network sites The shift in delivery systems was precipitated by the long-standing guideline of providing a maximum of 3-4 years for project

funding, and the need to directly impact a larger number of districts. Also, the creation of state agency personnel lines to handle the dissemination and program improvement activities in this area speaks strongly for the Department's commitment to improve and expand vocational education opportunities for special needs students in Illinois.

The Consultants were supported, in part, by a graduate-level Special Needs Extern Program at the University of Illinois. Through this DAVTE-sponsored project four (4) advanced graduate students with background in vocational special needs education assisted the Special Needs Consultants in their field-based activities. In addition they prepared a series of special needs resource materials to be used by local administrators, teachers, counselors, and others. The Network site status reports that follow will note several interfaces that occurred this year between the Special Needs Consultants and the Network sites.

The Dissemination and Diffusion Center project at Illinois State University, which had operated during the last two years of the Network, was maintained during 1979-80. Additional copies of the materials developed at the Network sites were printed and disseminated. Direct assistance was provided to the Special Needs Consultants in the organization and operation of several regional materials dissemination workshops. In these workshops, LEA teams (vocational and special educators, counselors, and administrators) were provided with an overview of several different major resource materials that they could use at their high schools. Follow-up assistance and inservice was provided to the participating districts by the Special Needs Consultants. The Director of the ISU project, who was described in an earlier section of the report, also assisted in planning and conducting a series of inservice training sessions for the Special Needs Consultants.

## Fifth Year Follow-Up Study

1979-80 was the fifth school year that had passed since the establishment of the Network. Project IMPACT staff, in conjunction with DAVTE personnel, felt that continued monitoring and review of the Network project would be crucial since this was the first year that project funding had been withdrawn. A number of key questions were considered important in this review. They included: (1) To what extent have programs and services for special needs students been expanded, maintained, or reduced, (2) How have staffing and enrollment patterns changed, and (3) To what extent does each district continue to provide inservice and assistance to others.

## Procedures

A series of detailed questions were drafted for the follow-up study by he Project IMPACT staff. Several questions were submitted to the director the ISU Dissemination Center and the DAVTE staff (RDS section and Occupational Consultants section) for review and comment. Several revisions and refinements were made based upon their comments.

A questionnaire to be completed by the principal project staff members from each of the former sites was developed. Each of the nine questions included, provided for detailed, open-ended responses. Six of the eight sites returned at least one completed survey questionnaire.

Several other questions were posed during two interview sessions held in May, 1980. The sessions were held in suburban Robbins, Illinois and Springfield, Illinois. All of the principal project staff members from the eight sites were invited to attend with reimbursement provided for their travel expenses. These meetings enabled the Project

IMPACT staff to clarify and expand upon responses provided in the questionnaire, and pursue other, detailed questions that were too involved for the questionnaire. Four individuals attended the follow-up meeting in Robbins, while three former project directors and the director of the ISU Dissemination Center attended the session in Springfield. Each session lasted approximately three hours.

To prepare for the interview sessions, copies of each site's final report were requested and reviewed. These documents were extremely useful in developing an awareness of the diversity of approaches used by the sites and the developmental progress of each site.

Information was obtained for the 1979-80 postscript from each of the sites except one. Because of extensive staff turnover, Triton College was unable to identify anyone on their present staff that had been involved with the Network project. The lack of data and information regarding Triton's program and efforts severely restricts the conclusions and observations that Project IMPACT is able to draw because Triton was the only community college that had participated in the Network.

The following is a series of status reports describing the major goals, activities, and 1979-80 efforts of seven of the eight former Network sites. Each status report provides a description of what occurred at the site from 1975 to 1979, and closes with a review and discussions of the 1979-80 activities at the site.

Sauk Area Career Center

Background of the program from the final report

Major Activities (1975-79)

The Sauk Area Career Center (SACC), the only Vocational Center in the H & D Network, had as it objectives for the first year 1975-76 the following:

1. To develop a formal inservice training program for the area vocational center.
2. To organize a special team trained to support instructors in delivering training to disadvantaged and handicapped students in regular occupational programs.
3. To develop a learning skills laboratory for diagnosis and reassessment.
4. To develop a system for constant monitoring of the progress of disadvantaged and handicapped to implement program modifications.

An inservice training program was implemented on the basis of a needs assessment among the staff. A University of Illinois off-campus course was held at SACC, and teachers were paid to modify developing curriculum for use with handicapped and disadvantaged students. The special team was developed, including the special team leader, hired in December 1975; two support teachers who were hired Fall, 1976; and two paraprofessionals who were hired Spring, 1976. Commercial materials were investigated for the learning skills laboratory; extensive evaluation/exploration activities were developed for sophomore year students prior to enrolling at SACC. Systems were established for monitoring individual students.

Second year activities included the development of a program for special needs students at SACC and the development of processes and products that would be transportable to other educational agencies. Activities involved in establishing the program were an identification system, preservice and inservice programs for vocational teachers, a mainstreamed vocational educational program, the special needs support team, student IEPs, curriculum and teaching modifications, competency based reporting system, career exploration, pre-employment training curriculum, placement services and student follow-up, establishing a parent advisory council, and evaluation activities. All of the above were developed, keeping in mind the importance of the procedures and products being transportable, or easily adopted/adapted in other educational agencies.

The third year of the Network funding (1977-78) focused on dissemination of materials, processes and concepts developed at SACC. The program continued providing supportive services for special needs students at the same time. The staff at SACC targeted two areas for diffusion: all area vocational centers in the state, and high schools in south/southwest suburban Cook County. A brochure describing the project, and soliciting requests for materials and demonstrations was distributed to the target agencies. Three Open House activities were scheduled. Staff presented inservice at other area vocational centers, upon request. Special educations cooperative districts requested presentations from the special needs staff. All requests were honored. Project staff also participated in state-wide professional conferences, and responded to amil and phone requests. Media releases were also prepared describing the project. Local project activities also included

minigrants for vocational instructors and evaluation of special needs team activities were favorable from both vocational instructors and students.

During the final year of Network funding (1978-79), the program served 67 handicapped and 311 disadvantaged students. Services were provided in the areas of curriculum adaptations, individual help, technique modifications, guidance-counseling, vocational evaluations, home school consultations, teacher-student consultations and braille services. The great majority of occurrences were in teacher-student consultations. In addition, four mini-grant proposals were submitted and completed by vocational teachers at SACC in 1978-79. Constant monitoring of students resulted in increased referrals for assistance, and regular meetings helped coordinate services to individual students. Two new teachers were hired to replace vacancies on the special needs team. Diffusion and participation in workshops, conferences, and inservice continued for the staff of the project.

During 1979-80,when there was not DATVE funding, the Local District picked up the project. While there was no project director hired, three full-time staff members were retained to continue providing support services to H & D students at SACC; and there was a half-time secretary available. Services to student at SACC thus have remained at about the same level, and the numbers of students served about the same. Due to the fact that there was not a project director, and thus less staff available, there was not as much time to do vocational evaluations for sophomore special needs students, which may result in potential mismatches of student and program in the future.

Requests for information are being processed, and will be until the supply of materials is exhausted. Again, the local district is picking up the postage costs.

During 1979-80 there were two staff development activities conducted as a part of the district's inservice program. A meeting was held at SACC for approximately 40 special ed teachers and pre-vocational coordinators, on "Writing IEP's." The final inservice activity offered the total SACC faculty a full day of visiting the vocational and special ed programs at the home schools in Districts #228 and #227. The visit contributed to a better understanding among participating schools, and better communication concerning individual special need students. It is hoped that this visitation will be repeated next year, with faculty switching schools.

There were no mini-grants this year. The former project director reported some dissatisfaction with what had been done the previous year on mini-grants, and noted a lack of enthusiasm from faculty to take on the extra work.

Work with the former satellite sites consisted primarily with the other AVSs visiting SACC. Some of the sites have modeled their programs after SACC's, and have hired special needs support personnel teams. Inservice sessions conducted for groups outside of the district in a formal setting have not been done this year. There have been many visitors to SACC, however, who have been given informal inservice information while visiting.

Next year's plans include active recruitment of H & D students in the school districts participating in the Joint Agreement. It is felt by the current staff that there is a definite need to re-acquaint personnel

with the services provided H & D students at SACC due to personnel turnover. It was noted that the degree of local commitment, which has been substantial this year, can be measured more fully next year by whether or not the District increases supportive services, in the form of more staff, for the expected increased enrollment when the new building opens.

Joliet

Background of the program from the final report

Major Activities (1975-79)

"This project varies from the typical DAVTE project designed to develop, research, evaluate or disseminate one product/program. The staff and financial resources were deliberately and systematically used as a catalyst. The underlying intent of all project activities was to provide "seed money," incentives, and support in such a way that the particular activity would be maximally self sustaining." (Taken from the Preface, Final Report, Joliet Site: Handicapped & Disadvantaged Project.)

One hundred and sixty-nine mini-grants were awarded to the Joliet staff between October, 1975 and June, 1978. Some people were awarded more than one grnat, and some staff were involved only in diffusion, others in strengthening existing programs. Many products were developed during the funding years. Product abstracts included in the final report reflect the variety and extent of efforts generated by the Joliet staff. Criteria for selection for abstracting the products included primarily the degree of transportability, and the interest of people in the field in adopting/adapting each. Examples are: Faculty Focus on Learning Disabilities, Test your Insight into Eyesight, Address Aggression, Programming the Retarded in Career Education (PRICE), Student Handbook Translated Into Spanish, Career Resource Centers Within a Media Center, Pupil Personnel Services: What is PPS? PPS Team.

As the project progressed, more emphasis was placed on diffusion/technical assistance of the products/processes developed. Considerable

effort was given to presentations, displays at conferences and workshops, from the Spring of 1976 to June, 1979. Not only was there a great deal of external diffusion and dissemination, but efforts were made to provide technical assistance within the District as well.

One of the goals of the project was staff development, and during the two year period 1976-78, an individualized system of staff development was developed and implemented. Some of the topics included: Identification of H & D Students, Existing Programs and Services, Racism, Stereotypes and Prejudice, Individual Education Plan/Individual Vocational Education Plan, Mental Retardation and Minimum Competencies (PRICE), Career Decision Making, Sex Role Stereotyping, Basic Survival Skills, Process Education, and Using the Career Resource Center.

According to the final report, the project is believed to be "inordinately successful." This is based on statistical data, as well as anecdotal data and feedback from those both inside the district and outside. Credit is given to the fourth year of the project, which yielded many results, and was far more cost effective than any other year of operation.

Programs and services for special needs students during 1979-80 have not come to a grinding halt with the cessation of DAVTE funding. One new program which has been started as a pilot project this summer is a co-op program for Trainable and Autistic students with Con-Edison. Furthermore, there have been expanded summer youth programs (CETA funded)--up from 65 to 155 this year, and drawing on three school districts. In addition, CETA/Department of Labor Funding, have provided for a new Assessment Center at which up to 300 students have been tested. In addition, there has been added a Career Development

Training Program for disadvantaged youth with math deficiencies. This also is CETA funded.

The Project Director and Project Secretary are no longer on staff due to lack of DAVTE funding. However, there are considerable numbers of new staff due to the increased CETA funding and programming. There has been an increase in the number of H & D students identified this year, perhaps due to the new system. Total vocational education enrollment is up from Spring 1979, by about 15%. The computerized system for identification of H & D students has been re-vamped, and switched to a new Data Center. There are still some problems being worked out, but print-outs are given to each teacher indicating potential handicaps/problems.

Staff have had minimal involvement in workshops and technical assistance to other districts. All materials requests have been referred to ISU for dissemination.

Springfield

Background of the program from the final report

Major Activities (1975-79)

Springfield Public Schools, with three senior highs, four middle schools, and the Capitol Area Vocational Center, began working with the Network in 1975. The first component of the proposal for that year (1975-76) was to improve the quality of local occupational programs for disadvantaged and handicapped stuoents through the aevelopment of activities and services based on inservice activities and/or through staff orientation on one-to-one basis. As a consequence of the first year activities, in which a variety of delivery systems to provide information to staff were implemented, materials were developed and evaluated, and inservice education was provided. The second year of Network funding concentrated on increasing recruitment of handicapped and disadvantaged, continuation of inservice activities, developing and evaluating programs to meet the individual needs of special needs students, and concentrating on processes for serving the special needs students in the areasof articulation, sequential programming, supportive services in all of the attendance centers. In addition providing time and funding for staff to develop programs and services for students was a major thrust. During this second year, numerous process guides and manuals were developed for identifying students, assessing occupational interests and abilities, and disseminating information to staff. One of the primary planning guides to evolve out of the Network, SCOPE--Suggested Career Occupational Program Electives Handbooks, was developed at Springfield during this year. A Community Resource Handbook was

also developed, as was the Competency Based Guidance Program, and the Counselor's Handbook.

Phase three, the third year of the Network was divided into two main components--dissemination/diffusion and program. The project staff were involved with many state-wide conventions, and responded to numerous requests for materials and assistance.

The final year (1978-79) of the project had two primary goals: working with a minimum of five other sites (local education agencies) on a one-to-one basis, and providing a more centralized and unified approach to inservice and diffusion activities directly related to serving the special needs students, teachers, and administrators. A variety of delivery systems was used to disseminate project findings, both internally and externally. Included were printed brochures, memos, announcements, interpersonal communication, technical assistance, conventions, and workshops.

The Springfield district of the H & D Network did not receive funding in 1979-80. Despite this fact, two new positions were added in the District: a full-time coordinator for handicapped students in vocational education, and a full time H & D resource specialist for handicapped students at the Capitol Area Vocational Center. Existing staff have been reorganized to provide a full time learning disabilities resource person all periods of the day at each of the three high schools. The District has increased funding for the Career Resource Center. Several programs have been opened as open entry/open exit programs for handicapped students. There has also been an increase in other supportive services such as smaller class sizes, curriculum development, sequential programming, mini-grants, recruitment, and special vocational

classes. Staff were sent to several state sponsored H & D conferences for inservice. There also has been increased linkage with CETA, Adult Education and State Department Personnel.

Four new special programs have been implemented this year (auto service repair, industrial occupational orientation program, SEEDS program, and Teacher Aide Program for severely retarded--the later two were CETA funded; the former, District 186 funded). One self-contained program has been phased out. In addition, several other new programs have been planned for implementation in 1980-81, e.g. business office model program, maid service program for severely retarded, special ed work related program, and special needs exploratory program at all middle schools. CETA, District #186, and Dissemination Network funds are being used.

There has been about a 50% increase in the numbers of D & H students, served in vocational education perhaps due to better identification procedures. Of 460 special education secondary eligible students, 346 were placed in regular vocational classes this past year (1979-80). Several requests for materials were received this year. As frequently as possible they were fulfilled from the district office, despite the lack of a project secretary, and postal expenses.

Inservice activiites concentrated primarily on parents of handicapped children this year. Also, a half-day inservice activity at four middle schools was provided which related to mainstreaming program planning. Another inservice was aimed at vocational educators in terms of recruitment of D & H students, and a community life skills conference was held for the entire Springfield Community. Informal inservice continued on a one-to-one basis.

The former project staff at Springfield did have some contact with one of their former satellite sites--the Danville Area Vocational Center. This group received a DAVTE mini-grant and adopted many of the concepts and elements of the Springfield program. Much of the assistance provided to the Danville Area Vocational Center has been provided by one of the DAVTE Special Needs Consultants.

Herrin Community Unit District 4

Background of their program from the final report

Major Activities (1975-79)

TIPS--To Improve the Probability of Success--was the primary focus of the Herrin involvement in the H & D Network. This program used Mentors (tutors-counselors) to assist students who were failing in any of their subjects in their vocational programs. The subjects were not limited to vocational subjects, and often were the basic, required subjects such as English and math which are instrumental to successful completion of vocational classes. The program was implemented during the first year, and evaluations--both statistical and subjective--suggested that the project continue into the second year. Mentors were paraprofessionals, persons who had completed at least two years of college. The role of mentor was conceived to be "flexible and versatile: tutor, friend, counselor, facilitator, and advocate" (from final report, Description of Project; Objectives and Methodology of a Survey to Assess Project Impact).

During the second year, the techniques used by the Mentors were put together in a booklet, A Mentor's Manual, and some of the strategies were included in An Administrative Guide. Brochures were created for informing and interesting others in the project.

An evaluation at the end of the third year showed that gains continued despite an administrative policy change regarding attendance. A pilot project of TIPS was established at Flora, Illinois during the third year, to serve as a model for other districts closer and further away from Herrin.

During the fourth year, Herrin continued as an exemplary site; Flora was established as a second demonstration site, and two satellite sites were added--West Frankfort and Carterville. The goal of the sites remained that of demonstrating the roll of mentors and the system for mentor services, but the role of the Program Director was expanded. The new responsibilities for the director included staff development; dissemination of Network findings, processes, and products; and arranging for Network knowledge and products to be included in University credit courses for both pre-service and inservice training. Many workshops were held and materials were disseminated. Inservice programs throughout the state as well as in the project school were held. Materials from the TIPS program were used in a seminar for faculty of Eastern Illinois University's Vocational Education and Special Education Departments. SIU-Carbondale faculty served as advisors to the program and participated in the Regional workshops; some SIU-C staff cooperated in research activities. The Mentor concept was used as a model for a CETA funded program to expand the services to all schools in Jackson county; and was coordinated by a former TIPS Mentor. Furthermore, the SIU-C College of Education published a monograph about the Mentor Model which used the TIPS program as a working example.

During the 1979-80 School Year, the H & D Network was not funded. However, the follow-up study revealed the following items of interest about the Herrin site.

Herring had not mentor services available to students this year, unless the regular classroom teacher found time to provide them. There was an attempt to use CETA funding for mentors, but none of

the individuals qualified for mentoring were available. All other supportive services were continued, and the number of special needs students served has increased. In addition, there was a half-time staffing increase of a supervisor for special needs handicapped students in community work sites. Materials requests, about twenty, have been received and forwarded to Illinois State University. Project and high school staff from Herrin have participated in inservice workshops in the state. Also one formal inservice activity was held for the entire vocational education, guidance and special education faculty and other interested staff at Herrin. Prior in-house activities had been informal. A need for continuing in-service activities regarding special needs learners was noted.

Herrin's satellite sites have had varied results this year. Carterville hired their mentor on Title I Reading funds. Flora had to drop all types of support services due to a series of fires, and destruction of school property. The program initiator at West Frankfort was on sabbatical this past year, and it appears as no one else really took over.

SIU-Carbondale assisted in establishing a mentor prototype for Jackson County using CETA funds--teachers who couldn't get jobs are working schools as mentors four days a week, and also taking graduate seminars through SIU-C to be re-tooled.

Edwardsville

Background of the program from the final report

Major Activities (1975-79)

The primary focus of the project at Edwardsville was to:

1. develop an inservice program for faculty and staff,
2. develop a non-computerized identification system which involves the entire faculty, and
3. revise vocational curriculum for special needs students.

In the first two years of the project at Edwardsville many things were accomplished. An identification system for handicapped and disadvantaged students was developed. Inservice training of faculty was begun. Curriculum revision guides were developed, and new vocational courses were implemented. Handbooks, The Right Job, Pupil Resources, were developed for students and teachers. PATL--Positive Attitude Toward Learning Project was initiated and faculty mini-grants were awarded. The PEGASUS Title IV reading program was adopted for implementation, and identification of handicapped and disadvantaged students at the junior high level was started.

The year, 1977-78, emphasized dissemination and diffusion of the Network activities, including presentations at both other districts and statewide meetings. Local in-service continued and "massive amounts of materials" were disseminated. Presentations were made for SIU-Edwardsville High School through Lewis and Clark ollege in the Fall of 1978. One of the main strengths of the Edwardsville program is the use of the local community. During the 1977-78 year a file of 400 resource people in the community was compiled. Six Satellite Sites were

added and given mini-grants and assistance. During 1978-79, technical assistance, conference presentations, workshop contributions and work with the satellite sites continued.

This past year, 1979-80, without funding, requests from former project staff for inservice presentations have increased. There appears to be a gradual increase in the number of special needs students in vocational education classes, perhaps due to better identification procedures. Seventy-three percent of the total high school student population are enrolled in vocational classes, up five percent in the past five years. Special needs student enrollment is up proportionally. A new typing program for EMH students which was to have begun this year was delayed, although the machines were purchased. A home economics class for educably mentally handicapped is to begin next year. This summer there is to be a CETA program for drop-outs, alternative vocational education, and YETP students and SPEDY programs.

Materials requests have been answered, or forwarded to Illinois State University. Satellite site mini-grant requests have come in and could not be provided. The former project staff have continued to be involved with professional activities outside the district and within the district. The special education staff conducted two inservice sessions for 18 building and program administrators, funded through special education budgets. An after-school session of industrial and cooperative teachers each presenting 10-15 minutes of formal reporting on their activities was very successful. A continuing need for inservice was noted due to about a 25% turnover in staff. The district has added an item to the personnel application concerning experience/training in dealing with special needs students

The 1978-79 Edwardsville satellite sites were worked with only an informal and somehat minimal basis this year. The DATVE Special Needs Consultant Needs Consultant has continued the work begun in selected satellite sites last year.

Tilden

Background of the program from the final report

Major Activities (1975-79)

The first year of the project was devoted to a needs assessment regarding inservice, teaching materials, and a system designed to improve vocational education for handicapped and disadvantaged students at Tilden. A teacher inservice program was developed and implemented. Documentation of all inservice programs was developed and implemented. Documentation of all inservice planning regarding the inservice program was done in order to provide a delivery system for vocational education teacher inservice within the Chicago Public Schools with Tilden serving as the model.

Phase 2, 1976-77, was the pilot testing, modification and monitoring of the proposed individual services systems from Phase 1. Procedures were developed to provide individual services with a minimum of disruption. Implementation and coordination of the general service components, designed in Phase I was also accomplished. Peer tutoring, under teacher guidance, was one of the features. During Phase 2 the individual identification, referral and service system was used for the first time. Mini-grants, additional teacher-inservice, school-based related university courses all were offered to improve services. Dissemination of information about the project's materials center to the total Tilden staff was accomplished. Again, documentation of the processes used was an important factor, so that Tilden could be used as a model for other Chicago and other large systems.

In Phase 3, 1977-78, the pilot program was continued at Tilden and was also used for demonstration. Six additional sites (Chicago high schools) were added with Tilden serving as the model and providing the leadership and technical assistance. A comprehensive manual was developed for use at the other sites and the Project Materials Center was used by all nine sites (Tilden plus the eight additinal ones). Mini-grants and staff development continued. Documentaion concerning the relationship with the eight sites was maintained for dissemination and implementation with other sites.

In 1978-79, Phase IV, six sites were continued, and five additional sites were added making a total of 12 high schools directly involved in the project. All of the programs begun in Phases I-III were maintained and improved. The Project Materials Center was used by all 12 sites, and additional items were purchased, catalogued, and made available to the staff at all 12 sites. Additional data collection and evaluation was intiated so that the concept of using Tilden as a model site could continue.

The materials developed at Tilden include: Guidance Curriculum Guide, an Identification Manual, and Administrator Handbook, and Peer Tutoring Guidelines. The extent to which these were disseminated is uncertain.

In 1979-80, unlike the other Network sites, Tilden High School was funded again. The final report for Phase V, 1979-80, lists continued implementation and program development at the pilot site, Tilden, with continuation of all Phase II, III, and IV components for student services and demonstration, as the first goal. Work continued with the dissemination and program development activities at the other eleven

high schools. Coordination and materials development plus dissemination procedures were the responsibility of the project coordinator, as was working directly with personnel from other local education agencies. Additional items for the Project Materials Center were purchased, catalogued, and made available to all 12 sites, as well as the whole district. Mini-grants and studff development activities were used to continue to identify and develop new program components. Again extensive documentation was maintained in order to use Tilden High School as a demonstration model for improving services to special needs students in vocational education in a large urban setting.

Mount Prospect High District 214

District 214 was unusual in comparison to the other Network sites. In 1975 it already had established a wide range and variety of programs for serving special needs students. Therefore, one of the first things done under Network funding was to survey the teachers for their needs. One main area of need evidenced by the survey was that of more information about the existing programs in District 214. Thus, initially the focus of the program at District 214 was that of providing the staff with more information--both about the programs and evaluation of the programs.

Communication was accomplished through two different systems. A Catalog of Exemplary Programs was developed in order to describe and disseminate information about each of the programs existing in the District. In addition, a "Sharing: District Diffusion Center" newsletter was published periodically. Due to increased knowledge about the many programs, student enrollment was increased. Some of the Exemplary Programs (to select just a few from the Catalog) are: Auto Body Repair Program, Individualized Resource Program (IR), Practical Architectural Construction Program (PAC), Special Education - Driver Education Program, Bilingual Program, Vocational Cosmetology Program, and Youth Opportunities Unlimited Program (YOU).

Evaluation activites were conducted for improvement of vocational education for the special needs students. Parents, students, teachers, and the community were all taken into consideration in the assessment. One of the interesting evaluation instruments was the Report Card for High School District 214 rated by community members selected randomly. Grades were given for ten subjects, including preparation of students

for world of work, management of financial resources, responsiveness to community, etc.

Of the Exemplary Programs described in the Catalog, one in particular was found to be an excellent model for serving special needs students: The Individualized Resource Program. The Program calls upon a number of different support personnel to be involved in providing services to individual special needs students as needed.

This past year, without Network funding, services have remained at the high level prior to Network funding. This year, one new program was initiated and two existing programs were adjusted. According to the follow-up questionnaire:

> "In the past students with severe learning disability problems were placed in a private school. In 1979-80, District 214 and its special education cooperative established our own facility.
>
> Our I.R. staff was increased by two in all eight high schools to better meet the needs of the students in that program.
>
> WECEP has been added to each building instead of just Forest View. In Addition WECEP is now offered at STEP, Gregory School (a special education facility) and Wilson school (the new learning disability facility). In addition to WECEP at our STEP program, the coordinator there has increased the utilization of CWT and programs such as cosmetology. Limited placement of STEP students in vocational courses in the buildings has also taken place."

Enrollment patterns have remained the same this year without Network funding. However there have been staff changes at the end of the 1979 school year. Two vocational education teachers were cut due to declining enrollment. This is seen as "a dilemma" as special needs

students are encouraged to acquire vocational skills, yet the number staff providing vocational instruction may be on the decline.

As a follow-up to the major inservice program instituted under the last year of Network Funding, special needs vocational education inservice activities were offered at all District Workshops this past year. According to the questionnaire respondent, staff acceptance and cooperation regarding special needs students has increased significantly.

The former Project Director reports that he and several staff members made presentations at conferences, meetings and workshops this past year, and commends the District for its generosity in allowing staff to attend professional meetings even in a time of declining financial resources.

The District has received about five letters per month requesting information about specific programs. Those are answered and materials provided when available.

Observations

When examined in a five year context, there are several key observations that can be made about the Network. It should be noted, however, that these observations are general in nature about the schools that participated in the Network for the full four years. While the project funding generally stimulated special needs programming and support services in 1975-76, numerous other factors (.e.g staff receptiveness, local fiscal support, community awareness of special needs populations, etc.) influenced the direction and rate of program development at each site. As intended, each site tailored its program to fit local special needs populations, philosophies, and delivery systems. This led to a wide diversity of activities and approaches among the sites. Hence, it is not feasible or wise to draw major comparative conclusions regarding the Network. It is possible to make several observations about the Network sites that pertain to the early and later periods of DAVTE support, as well as 1979-80 when the funding for the Network was discontinued.

1. In all cases the H & D Network funding led to the enhancement and expansion of special needs programs and support services for special needs students within the funded districts. In addition to formalizing special needs programming and support services, the project funding appears to have increased staff, employer and community awareness of the local project efforts. The local publicity assocaited with the initial project funding and the subsequent activities have created a positive set of local attitudes regarding vocational

programming for special needs students. Everyone interviewed and questionnaire respondents felt that the Network project involvement had been excellent from this standpoint.

2. With only one exception, the programs and services established with the project funding had been maintained during 1979-80 at the seven sites reporting in the follow-up study. In a couple of cases the Districts had expanded their special needs efforts in 1979-80 above the 1978-79 level. Either local district funds or funds from other sources (e.g. CETA) had been used to maintain the programs. It appears that most of the participating districts had been planning to pick up these services. Since 1977 several districts had been increasing the local district fiscal contribution to the project. One is left with the feeling that from the outset, the districts participating in the Network felt strongly and positively about the research, development and demonstration efforts and the need to effectively serve special needs students. These outcomes confirm the importance of sincere local commitments when funding projects of this type.

3. Generally, the sites reporting in the follow-up study indicated that the number of handicapped and disadvantaged students served in vocational education programs had increased over previous years. The increased special needs enrollments were attributed to improvements in the identification system used by the local district. It is significant to note that in one of the large districts formerly in the Network, more than 75% of the high school age special education students are enrolled in

a vocational education course. Generally, those administrators and counselors who were contacted, indicated that they had worked with the staff in formalizing the identification process. These individuals felt that the staff generally understood the identification procedure; and, more importantly, they were directly involved in some aspect of it in most districts. Evaluation reports from local districts in Illinois frequently indicate that teachers are not familiar with their district's identification process. To a large extent the project funding over a four year period enabled most of the participating districts to involve all, or nearly all, of their vocational education, special education, and guidance staff in some aspect of the project. Most Network sites conducted at least one or two staff inservice sessions on procedures and criteria for identification of special needs students.

4. In nearly all cases, staff that had been involved in the H & D projects were employed by the local districts as counselors, administrators or teachers prior to the Network initiation in 1975. As previously noted in the report these individuals tended to be experienced and energetic professionals who were recruited by top level district administrators to develop the initial proposal. Of the sites participating in the follow-up survey, only one had recruited and hired project staff from outside of the District. As a result of the H & D Network projects, these individuals achieved considerable visibility within their districts, and in some instances statewide visability, for their project leadership responsibilities. During 1979-80 a variety of transitions took place for these

individuals. At one site a position of director of occupational programs for H & D students position was created for the former project director. At four sites the project staff essentially returned to their original job responsibilities. In some instances, however, they were involved to some extent in managing special programs (e.g. summer programs for disadvantaged students). At another site the former project director position was eliminated and the individual became the coordinator of the Special Needs Support Team.

It would appear that the former project directors and principal staff have continued to provide leadership but at a level of reduced visibility, within their local districts relative to vocational education for special needs students. In several instances these individuals have also worked with other districts, the Illinois State Board of Education, state universities, and statewide task forces during 1979-80. An important but largely unrecognized, outcome of the Network has been the development of a number of individuals who continue to assist in special needs program development efforts outside of their local districts.

5. There were several instances of adoption of programming models and strategies reported by the Network sites. Most of these instances of adoption occurred during the dissemination and diffusion phases of the project (1977-79), but several were also reported during 1979-80. Programs for mentors (aides), special needs support teams, and selected curriculum guides were most frequently reported as adopted by other

local districts. In most instances it appears that adoption of ideas occurred when multiple staff from nearby school districts visited the Network site on more than one occasion. Adoption tended to occur in similar size and type districts following extensive discussions in which the project staff came to know representatives of the adopting school on personal and professional basis.

The materials (curriculum guides, handbooks, teaching materials, etc.) developed by the Network site personnel were extensively disseminated via the Dissemination and Diffusion Center at Illinois State University during 1977-79. This dissemination effort continued and was expanded during 1979-80. Several of the sites continued to recieve requests for locally developed materials during 1979-80. Some reported being able to fulfill these requests while others forwarded the requests to Illinois State.

6. One of the major thrusts in the final year of the Network (1978-79) was to work on a concentrated basis with selected districts. Generally, these were districts that were geographically close to the Network site and operated similar size or type programs. These districts became known as satellite sites. Since Sauk and Triton were the only area vocational center and community college in the Network, they were asked to work with selected area vocational centers and community colleges throughout the state. The impact upon the satellite sites appears to have varied with the effort of the Network sites. In two-three instances the impact upon

satellite sites has been extensive and continuing. However, for the most part, the 1979-80 follow-up survey revealed that little communication has been maintained with the satellite sites.

7. An interesting observation from the 1979-80 survey data focuses upon the continuing need for inservice staff development efforts. One might conjecture that, after four years of progarm development and formal as well as informal inservice training, the staff development would not be a critical need. Yet, all of the Network sites reporting indicated that they have continued to provide requested inservice workshops and information to groups and individuals within their own districts. Staff turnover was cited as the primary reason for the continuing inservice need. Several former project directors noted that several staff who were initially provided with inservice in 1975-76 have left their positions.

8. Another concern in the 1979-80 Network follow-up survey was the interface between the new DATVE initiative (the Special Needs Consultants) and the Network sites. Three of the seven sites reporting appear to have been extensively involved with the Special Needs Consultant assigned to their region. In all instances the Special Needs Consultant has taken the initiative to visit the Network site to learn about the program(s). These individuals have utilized this information in a variety of ways. In one instance additional inservice has been provided at the Network site by the Consultant. Other consultants have used members of the former

Network project staffs in conducting inservice workshop sessions within the region. Two consultants have directly followed-up the work of the Network sites with one or more of the satellite sites. These efforts to interface the Network and Consultant projects appear to have been quite positive and productive. Similar efforts are needed with the other Network sites to assure that the resources and ideas developed throughout the project are fully utilized.